



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/825,084	04/02/2001	Ian Catley	112740-187	1678
29177	7590	06/30/2005	EXAMINER	
BELL, BOYD & LLOYD, LLC P. O. BOX 1135 CHICAGO, IL 60690-1135			UBILES, MARIE C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2642	

DATE MAILED: 06/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/825,084	Applicant(s) CATLEY ET AL.	
	Examiner Marie C. Ubiles	Art Unit 2642	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 March 2005.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2 and 4-7 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 2 and 4-7 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment filed on March 28, 2005 has been entered. Claim 7 has been amended. Claim 1 has been cancelled. No claims have been added. Claims 2 and 4-7 are still pending in this application, with claim 7 being independent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

3. Claims 4 and 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis et al. (US 4,436,962) in view of Herrick et al. (US 5,521,970).

As for claim 7, Davis et al. (US 4,436,962) discloses a method of providing team functions (or *group coverage*) in a communications network (or *telephone system*) (See Abstract, lines 1-3) having a plurality of subscriber terminals (or call covering stations) (See Fig. 9, elements 902, 903, 104), each subscriber terminal having at least one subscriber line associated therewith (See Col. 2, lines 64-67), the method comprising, assigning the plurality of subscriber lines to a call acceptance group (or *group coverage*)(See Col.1, lines 55-61 and Col. 11, line 44 through Col. 12, line 3), switching the call to the first subscriber terminal (or *principal station*) and signaling a second subscriber terminal (or *simultaneously*) for call answering when the call is received under a first operating mode (as read on "each of the stations of a pre-specified coverage group is flashed"); and signaling the call in parallel on a second subscriber

line for call answering a second subscriber terminal when the call is received under a second operating mode; and signaling said call in parallel on the first subscriber line and on the second subscriber line for call answering on said first and second subscriber terminals (See Col. 1, lines 53-65).

It can be seen that Davis et al. lacks the limitation specifying “encompassing multiple communication systems” and “[assigning the plurality of subscriber lines to a call acceptance group] among a plurality of the multiple communication systems.”.

In regards to this, Herrick et al. teaches “Specifically according to the invention, in response to invocation of call coverage for a call that is connected to a first switch, the first switch connects the call to a second switch that serves a call-covering endpoint of the call, and also the first switch signals the second switch that the call is a coverage call. In response to receiving the signaling, the second switch determines the availability of the call-covering endpoint to receive the call. If the call-covering endpoint is available, the second switch alerts (e.g., *rings*) the call-covering endpoint of the call, and also signals the first switch that the call-covering endpoint is available.

Advantageously, since there is substantially no delay between determining the available status of the endpoint and the undertaking (including alerting) to connect the call to the endpoint, there is no danger of the available status becoming obsolete before the connecting can be undertaken. If the call-covering endpoint is not available, the second switch signals the first switch to that effect. In response to receiving the signaling that the call-covering endpoint is not available, the first switch disconnects the call from the second switch. Advantageously, in this latter case, the

call is again merely connected to the first switch as it was prior to commencement of the coverage efforts, the first switch has not lost control of the call to the second switch, and hence the first switch can continue to attempt to cover the call as dictated by the coverage path of the endpoint that was the original destination of the call. The total net effect of the invention is that call coverage works--from a user viewpoint--identically across a network of switches as it does on a single switch." (See Summary of the Invention, Col. 2, lines 11-40).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the method by configuring the call acceptance group such that first said first subscriber terminal (See Fig 1, element 11) and said at least second subscriber terminal (See Fig. 1, element 22) belong to multiple communications systems (See Fig. 1, *PBX 10* and *PBX 20*), as taught by Herrick et al.; thus providing a method for call forwarding in which --from a user viewpoint- the call coverage across a network of switches behaves identically, as it does on a single switch.

As for claim 6, Davis et al. also discloses that a call made to the first subscriber line is diverted to a second subscriber terminal on which corresponding user information was entered (See Claim 15 of Davis et al.).

Claim 4 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 7.

4. Claims 2 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis et al. (US 4, 436, 962) in view Herrick et al. (US 5,521,970) as applied to claims 4

and 6-7 above, and further in view of Brown et al. (US 5,309,028); as per the reasons set forth in the Office Action mailed on 9/27/2004.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed March 28, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding Applicant's argument that Herrick "does not address assigning call acceptance groups among a plurality of the multiple communications systems"; the Examiner respectfully disagrees. As discussed in Herrick's abstract, the first switch redirects the call to a remote call-covering endpoint covered by a second switch; but the the first switch never loses control over the call and does not terminate connection until the first switch decides whether the covering switch is available –or not- for coverage. At the end of the second switch, one can appreciate that terminals 21-22 comprise a "plurality of subscriber lines"; thus it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art that in the process explained above these lines are indeed being assigned to a call acceptance group (or "covering endpoint") among multiple communication systems (or PBX switches).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marie C. Ubiles whose telephone number is (571)272-7491. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am-6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad Matar can be reached on (571) 272-7488. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 09/825,084
Art Unit: 2642

Page 7

Marie C. Ubiles
June 20, 2005.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ahmad Matar". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Ahmad" and last name "Matar" clearly distinguishable.

AHMAD MATAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600